



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.43, No.39

October 5th, 2007

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: Shaky Foundations: The things readiest to be done, those which lie, not at the door but on the very table, of a man's mind, are not merely in general the most neglected, but even by the thoughtful man, the oftenest left alone, the oftenest postponed...

Truth is one, and he who does the truth in the small thing is of the truth; he who will do it only in a great thing, who postpones the small thing near him to the great farther from him, is not of the truth."
- from "George MacDonald: An Anthology" by C.S. Lewis 1946

THE 'PRIVATISATION' OF OUR WATER by John Brett: Readers of *On Target* need to direct their attention to an important book about the American people's experience of the 'privatising' (or corporatising) of their water supplies. The book is a must for all Australians so they can understand what they are in for (whichever political party gains power in the coming federal elections) unless they can forget their differences and take action!

The book is valued at \$AUS42 but has a thousand dollars worth of information in it. It takes examples of "Globalisation of water" from about ten U.S. cities, where turning their city water problems over to corporations, ended in disaster after great rate hikes. Every lesson we need to learn is in this book.

The familiar part for League activists in the battle to save our water is how we must mobilise grass roots organisations to have any effect. The other key is the local newspaper; it makes or breaks the campaign battle.

I see the first problem as being able to correctly define the "ownership" of water, which for a start would go something like this: Nobody owns *fresh* water, it is available to all as an essential for life and each person, or persons, or any organisation is the *custodian* of any fresh water as it passes through their safe custody.

Just as the Queen does not own the billions of dollars worth of property and art that has been donated to the nation over a thousand years. Her Majesty is the *custodian*, responsible to care for it, keep it in good condition and then pass it on to those who follow after. The national heritage is not to sell to help the poor and enrich the rich.

I purchased my copy of the book from Dymocks and these are the details:- Title is "Thirst" by Alan Snitow, Deborah Kaufman and Michael Fox, published by John Wiley & Sons, San Francisco - www.josseybass.com ISBN 978-0-7879-8458-8

In this issue: • *Thought For The Week* • *The 'Privatisation' Of Our Water* • *The Scam Is Working - Sydney Water Bills To Rise* • *The Local Government Amalgamation Battle On In Queensland* • *What Peter Goers Wouldn't Let Andrew Bolt Say*

"ON TARGET"

October 5th, 2007

Page 1 (153)

THE SCAM IS WORKING – SYDNEY WATER BILLS TO RISE: We are to believe that when a utility, such as a Water utility, reduces its services to the public, the costs go up! Australians will be paying more, much more, for far less services, under the great and grand 'privatisation' scams, than when their government authority provided a service.

Clare Masters of the *Daily Telegraph* reported, 18/9/07: "Household water bills in Sydney are set to spike by \$100 next year and will increase more with Sydney Water claiming they will be in the poor house without the price rise. Sydney Water executives claim the corporation is out of pocket more than \$20 million due to water policing patrols from extended water restrictions and predict the cost of the desalination plant will place them further in the red.

The rises mean a 33 per cent increase to a typical household bill over the four years, rising from about \$820 in 2007-08 to \$920 in 2008-09 to \$1095 in 2011-12.

A spokesman for Sydney Water yesterday told *The Daily Telegraph* without the extra funds the conglomerate (a group of diverse companies run as a single organisation...ed) will be forced to get a bank loan or go hat in hand to the N.S.W. Treasury to ask for more money. The rises are part of Sydney Water's submission to the Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunals (IPART's) review. "The other reason for the price rise is to improve Sydney Water's financial position. Due to the drought, among other things, water sales have been \$380 million less than IPART projected," Sydney Water's managing director, Dr. Kerry Schott, said. Sydney Water's submission claims the "longest drought in 100 years" coupled with water saving schemes, increased operating costs and borrowings means that it is not sustainable without more price increases..."

Editor's note: I have frequently heard that the cities take roughly 8 per cent of Australia's water supply. This leaves 92 per cent we don't know or hear about. Australia, I am told produces enough food to feed 80 million people. We are a population of only 20 million – give or take a couple of million.

I have a question: How much of Australia's precious water is not only used in the growing of this food for 60 million people around the world, but how much of our precious water supply forms part of that exported food, wine, etc?

When did we lose sight of the fact that the system exists to serve the people not the people the system? If we as a nation have provided ourselves with enough food, clothing and shelter why on earth are we allowing the system to force us to produce more and more to be exported – at our own cost and to our own detriment?

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AMALGAMATION BATTLE IN QUEENSLAND: John Brett continues: We have just finished e-mailing 160 Queensland Local Government Councils on the "Rule of Law", a specimen of one which is attached:

Subject: THE RULE OF LAW – TO ALL QUEENSLAND SHIRE COUNCILLORS:

Dear Sir or Madam,

Having contacted a number of Councils who had indicated resistance to forced amalgamation, there has been some very disconcerting feedback coming from Councillors who hold that it is now Law, and Councils must **comply**.

One of the cornerstones of Australia's Constitutional foundations is what is called "**The Rule of Law**", the alternative to which is "**The Rule of Men**". (Or women!)

The "**Rule of Law**" is simply man-made laws, that those living by them have collectively agreed to. The "**Rule of Men**" is simply laws imposed on all without the accord or authority of those who have to abide by them.

The genius of Australia's founding Constitutional architects was how, for the first time in history, they successfully separated Power from Authority, which has delivered to Australia the long period of stability not enjoyed by any other nation. We stand as the most successful nation in history.

The Constitution allowed Power to be exercised by the elected executive, on the Authority of our Representatives in Parliament assembled.

While Parliaments were given the *power*, **AUTHORITY** to use that power remained with the **ELECTORS**. (Through their 'Representative'.)

While it is obvious to most, that this is not working as intended at Parliamentary level, it was working very well and efficiently at Local Government level. In this case of forced amalgamation, the **Premier did not take his authority from our representatives in Parliament assembled**, he took his authority from a group of selected men, on a very high public salary, knowing as any normal person knows they would not deliver what they were not paid to deliver.

That infamous "**Commission**", mocks the "**Rule Of Law**" like it has never been mocked before and could be the precedent for worse offences to occur. If Local Government cannot, by way of the ballot box stop this blatant abuse of the Rule of law, we don't deserve to retain this passport to freedom, given so generously by those who went before us.

I would like to remind Councillors that dictatorship, by definition, is when one person or group of persons, posses both Power *and* Authority in their custody and become the sole executors of both.

With this explanation, I hope your Council goes to the Authority of your Electors by way of the Ballot Box. Otherwise you stand condemned the same as the [now former] Premier, for abandoning the Rule of Law. If you fail, we will go the same way as those European countries that also abandoned the Rule of Law, rendering our experience useless. But worse is the handing of this failure to the next generation, a failure not given to us.

Please pass this on to any Councillor or Council whom you feel might act in our best interests.

Yours sincerely, John Brett, 37 Palmer Drive, Highfields, Queensland, 4352.

WHAT PETER GOERS WOULDN'T LET ANDREW BOLT SAY: I just happened to switch on to Peter Goers (ABC Radio, Adelaide) last Monday night when he had Andrew Bolt as his guest. The discussion which had become quite heated, was on 'global warming' and Al Gore's movie "An Inconvenient Truth". Must admit I did enjoy the heated exchange. It seems Andrew Bolt, in his *Herald Sun* column, had taken Gore to task for the downright untruths in his movie and the fact that he had vested financial interests in promoting 'global warming'.

Peter Goers didn't want to hear this – nor did he want his listeners to hear it – hence the heated exchange; Goers 'bagging' and 'gagging' Bolt and trying to lead the discussion away from that hot topic. Finally, Bolt hung up on Goers well before the end of the scheduled programme.

The following article which comes from Canada is along the same lines as Andrew Bolt's claims.

Global warming? Look at the numbers, by Lorne Gunter, *National Post*, 13/8/2007: In his environmental propaganda flick, *An Inconvenient Truth*, Al Gore claims nine of the 10 hottest years on record have occurred in the last decade. That's been a common refrain for environmentalists, too, and one of the centrepieces of global warming hysteria: It's been really hot lately – abnormally hot – so we all need to be afraid, very afraid. The trouble is, it's no longer true.

Temperature data error 'quietly' corrected by NASA: Last week, NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies – whose temperature records are a key component of the global-warming claim (and whose director, James Hansen, is a sort of godfather of global-warming alarmism) – quietly corrected an error in its data set that had made recent temperatures seem warmer than they really were.

A little less than a decade ago, the U.S. government changed the way it recorded temperatures. No one thought to correlate the new temperatures with the old ones, though – no one until Canadian researcher Steve McIntyre, that is. McIntyre has become the bane of many warmers' religious-like belief in climate catastrophe. In 2003, along with economist Ross McKittrick, McIntyre demolished the Mann "hockey stick" – a graph that showed stable temperatures for 1,000 years, then shooting up dangerously in the last half of the 20th Century. The graph was used prominently by the U.N. and nearly every major eco lobby. But McIntyre and McKittrick demonstrated it was based on incomplete and inaccurate data.

To NASA's credit, when McIntyre pointed out their temperature errors they quickly made corrections. Still, the pro-warmers who dominate the Goddard Institute almost certainly recognized the impacts these changes would have on the global-warming debate, because they made no formal announcement of their recalculations.

Changes are minor but impact on rhetoric are huge: In many cases, the changes are statistically minor, but their potential impact on the rhetoric surrounding global warming is huge. The hottest year since 1880 becomes 1934 instead of 1998, which is now just second; 1921 is third. Four of the 10 hottest years were in the 1930s, only three in the past decade. Claiming that man-made carbon dioxide has caused the natural disasters of recent years makes as much sense as claiming fossil-fuel burning caused the Great Depression. The 15 hottest years since 1880 are spread over seven decades. Eight occurred before atmospheric carbon dioxide began its recent rise; seven occurred afterwards.

In other words, there is no discernible trend, no obvious warming of late.

Ever since the correction became a hot topic on blogs, the pro-warmers have tried to downplay its significance, insisting, for example, that the alterations merely amount to "very minor rearrangements in the various rankings".

It's true the changes aren't dramatic. But the optics are. Imagine if the shoe were on the other foot. Imagine the shrieking of the warmers if we had previously thought that hot years were scattered throughout the past 130 years, but after a correction the warmest years could be seen to be concentrated in the past decade. They would insist the revised data proved their case. They would blitz every news organization and talk show. They would demand to be allowed to indoctrinate school children on the evils of cars and factories. So they shouldn't be permitted to brush aside this new data, which makes their claims harder to prove.

Ten years ago, warmers found a similarly small error in the temperature data collected by weather satellites. The satellites were a thorn in their sides because while the warmers were insisting the Earth was getting hotter, the satellites showed it was in fact cooling ever so slightly.

Then the warmers discovered that the scientists who maintained the orbiting thermometers had failed to account for orbital decay, the almost infinitesimally small downward drift of the "birds" every year. When the effects of drift were added into the observations, the cooling was found to be just 0.01 degree per decade rather than the 0.04 degrees previously claimed.

On this basis, the warmers now insisted then that even the satellites were somehow in agreement with their theory.

Of course, the current NASA changes are only for data collected in the United States. But available surface temperature readings cover only half the planet even today. Before the Second World War, they covered less than a quarter. So U.S. readings for a period that goes as far back as 1880 are among the most reliable there are.

Perhaps we will have uncontrollable warming in the future, but it likely hasn't started yet.

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell St., Melbourne.
Postal Address: GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.
Subscription \$40.00 p.a.